5th February 1934]

Irrigation

Mr. Priestley's report on the Tungabhadra Project.

* 638 *Q.*—The KUMARARAJA OF VENKATAGIRI: Will the hon. the Member for Revenue be pleased to state—

(*a*) whether the Government have received the report of Mr. Priestley regarding the Tungabhadra Project; and

(*b*) whether the Government will be pleased to place it on the table of the House before passing final orders on the matter?

A.—(*a*) Two preliminary reports have been received from Mr. Priestley.

(*b*) The question will be considered when a final report is received from the Irrigation Development Board.

Stoppage of the preliminary work started in connexion with the Tungabhadra Project.

* 639 *Q.*—Mr. K. A. NACHIYAPPA GOUNDER: Will the hon. the Member for Revenue be pleased to state—

(*a*) whether the preliminary work started in connexion with the Tungabhadra Project has been stopped now;

(*b*) if so, why and for what reasons;

(*c*) whether a copy of the order passed in the matter will be placed on the table; and

(*d*) what the amount spent over this work so far is?

A.—(*a*), (*b*) & (*c*) The answer to (*a*) is in the negative.

(*d*) Information has been called for.

Prices and Wages

Collectors' reports regarding the economic and seasonal situation in the districts.

* 640 *Q.*—Mr. G. LAKSHMANA REDDI: Will the hon. the Member for Revenue be pleased to state—

(*a*) whether the Government recently called for reports from the various District Collectors regarding the economic and seasonal situation in the districts in the Presidency with a view to afford land revenue relief; and

(*b*) if so, whether the Government will be pleased to place those reports on the table of the House?

A.—(*a*) & (*b*).—The attention of the hon. Member is invited to the answer to question No. 630.

Mr. A. RANGANATHA MUDALIYAR:—" In view of the fact that the Government independently and on the basis of the reports received from

[5th February 1934

the Collectors had decided to give larger remissions in the case of certain districts, will the Government now be pleased to revise their last order and grant remissions on a higher scale? "

The hon. Sir ARCHIBALD CAMPBELL:—" I am afraid I cannot answer that question now."

Mr. A. RANGANATHA MUDALIYAR:—" Is the matter under consideration, Sir? "

The hon. Sir ARCHIBALD CAMPBELL:—" Yes."

Proposals of the Collector of Salem for remission of land revenue.

* 641 Q.—Mr. K. A. NACHIYAPPA GOUNDER: Will the hon. the Member for Revenue be pleased to state—

(a) what report the Collector of Salem district made in the matter of remission of land revenue; and

(b) whether a copy of the report will be placed on the table?

A.—(a) & (b) The attention of the hon. Member is invited to the answer to question No. 630.

Police

Expenditure for bandobust in Nandyal and Atmakur in regard to procession before the mosque.

* 642 Q.—S. M. K. BEYABANI SAHIB Bahadur: Will the hon. the Home Member be pleased to place on the table of the House—

(a) the extra expenditure that the Government had to incur every time in 1933, for making bandobust in Nandyal and Atmakur in connexion with procession before the mosque; and

(b) the reports called for in 1933 regarding the acts of the police with regard to the Muslims of Nandyal?

A.—(a) The Government have no information but have called for it.

(b) The petition[a] received from certain Muslims of Nandyal in October 1933 is placed on the table of the House. As regards the allegations made therein, the District Magistrate has reported that—

(1) The allegation that the District Magistrate had been told that the Muslims intended to appeal against the order of the District Munsif is untrue.

(2) There was no indiscriminate arrest of persons. The total number of persons arrested was only seven of whom four were Muhammadans and three Hindus. Some had previous convictions and two others had been previously charged with assaulting constables on duty. The arrests were made

---

[a] Printed as Appendix V on page 555 infra.